

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ROCK HILL DIVISION

Nathaniel Mack)	C/A No.: 0:07-cv-02653-GRA
)	
Petitioner,)	ORDER
)	(Written Opinion)
v.)	
)	
Anthony Padula, Warden,)	
Lee Correctional Institution,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court for a review of the magistrate's Report and Recommendation made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(c), D.S.C., and filed on August 20, 2007. Petitioner, an inmate with the South Carolina Department of Corrections ("SCDC"), filed this *pro se* petition on August 1, 2007. On August 2, 2007, the magistrate issued an order directing the petitioner to submit an amended petition on the proper Section 2254 form and a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. In a letter dated August 14, 2007, Petitioner informed the Office of the Clerk of Court that he does not wish to file a habeas corpus petition at this time, because his case is still pending in the Court of Appeals. The magistrate recommends that the letter be treated as a motion for voluntary dismissal and that the case be dismissed, *without prejudice*, for failure to exhaust state court remedies.

Petitioner brings this claim *pro se*. This Court is required to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally. Such pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). This Court is charged with liberally construing a pleading filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow for the development of a potentially meritorious claim. *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982).

The magistrate makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). This Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and this Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This Court may also "receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate with instructions." *Id.*

In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198 (4th Cir. 1983). Petitioner did not file objections to the Report and Recommendation.

After a review of the magistrate's Report and Recommendation, this Court finds the report is based upon the proper law. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is accepted and adopted in its entirety.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be DISMISSED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



G. ROSS ANDERSON, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

November 6, 2007
Anderson, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this Order within thirty (30) days after the judgment of this Order is entered, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. Failure to meet this deadline, as modified within Rule 4, will waive the right to appeal.